

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

**Rejection of claims 1, 5, 13 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), figures 1-2, in view of
5 Sato, US 2006/0097380.**

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to specify that the driver chip (such as the
gate driver chip and the source driver chip) is thinned to reduce the stress created
between the chip and the glass substrate.

10

Despite Sato teaches a plurality of driver chips that are 0.3 mm or less, Sato fails
to suggest that these chips are thinned to reduce the stress created between the chip
and the glass substrate. Instead, Sato in paragraph [0067] of the cited reference
recites the "heat sink 53 becomes protuberant above the driver IC chip 9, and to avoid
15 this, the driver IC chip 9 is thinly polished or buffed", which clearly suggests that the
IC chip 9 disclosed in Sato's invention is specifically thinned to provide a plane
surface.

Sato therefore fails to teach, suggest, or in any way provide proper motivation to
20 fabricate a semiconductor module that those skilled in the art would find it reasonable
to combine with the liquid crystal module disclosed by the admitted prior art of the
present invention, in which the liquid crystal module is specifically fabricated for
relieving stress between IC chip and glass substrate thereby reducing curtain mura
between these two units.

25

Moreover, an anisotropic conductive film or a non-conductive film is utilized in
the present invention for bonding the driver chip and the glass substrate. Despite the
prior art of the present invention suggested the utilization of anisotropic conductive
film, this feature is clearly absent in Sato's invention. Instead, Sato in Fig. 9 of the
30 cited reference teaches that an underfill layer 51 is formed to bond the IC chip 9 and

the circuit board 3.

Applicants submit that if the driver chip taught by Sato is construed as the driver chip of the present invention, the adhesive (such as the underfill layer 51) used for bonding the driver chip must also be comparable to the adhesive (such as anisotropic conductive film) of the present invention. As the target substrate (such as the circuit board 3) and the adhesive (such as the underfill layer 51) disclosed in Sato are significantly different from the substrate (glass substrate) and adhesive (anisotropic conductive film) of the present invention, it is obvious that the liquid crystal display module taught by Sato cannot be combined with the admitted prior art of the present invention.

In light of the above, applicants submit that the liquid crystal display module of the present invention is patentable over the combined teachings of Sato and the admitted prior art of the present invention. Reconsideration of amended claims 1 and 13 is respectfully requested. As claims 5 and 16-21 are dependent upon claims 1 and 13, applicants submit that if claims 1 and 13 are found allowable, claims 5 and 16-21 should additionally be found allowable.

20

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/711,617
Amdt. dated December 15, 2008
Reply to Office action of October 08, 2008

Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/

Date: 12/15/2008

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)